REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on October 02, 2002. Claims 1-4, 7-9 and 13-16 are presented below in their last amended form for examination. Claims 1-4, 7-9 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Goodman (U.S. 5,844,596), hereinafter Goodman.

Claims 1, 2 and 7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 1 of U.S. patent No. 6,167,120. In response, applicant filed with the last response a terminal disclaimer, which should overcome the Examiner's objection to the claims. Further, the last sentence of the response filed with the terminal disclaimer states "If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534. This is the authorization to deduct the TD fee from the requisite deposit account.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art of Goodman, particularly the portions cited and applied by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements. Applicant herein provides facts and arguments to more particularly establish that the claims distinguish unarguably over the prior art. Applicant continues to argue that not all of the limitations of applicant's claim 1 are anticipated in the prior art of Goodman.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that Goodman discloses a networking system for a home or business site comprising all of the limitations of applicant's claim, including applicant's characterization in the claim, in that the bridge adapter unit drives the telephone wiring structure

according to a Local Area Network (LAN) protocol, translates the public network protocol signals to the LAN protocol, and modulates the signals in a manner to correct signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points driven from a single point at the bridge adapter unit.

In the previous response filed by applicant it was argued that Goodman does not disclose a bridge adapter unit driving the telephone wiring structure according to a LAN protocol, nor does Goodman disclose translating the public network protocol signals to the LAN protocol, or modulating the signals in a manner to correct signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points driven from a single point at the bridge adapter unit.

The Examiner responds to the above argument made by applicant, in "point a" of the "Response to Arguments" portion of the present Office Letter, stating that it is the Examiner's position that a bridge adapter unit (see Goodman, Fig. 1, item 400); having an inlet port for receiving public network protocol signals (see Goodman col. 8, lines 9-10) and a telephone wiring structure in the site, the wiring structure having multiple end points and one or more junctions (see Goodman Col. 8, lines 1-25).

Applicant argues that item 400 of Goodman is not a bridge adapter unit as disclosed and claimed in applicant's invention. Applicant's claims specifically recite that the bridge adapter unit is at the business or residential site is characterized in that the bridge adapter unit drives the telephone wiring structure according to a Local Area Network (LAN) protocol, translates the public network protocol signals to the LAN protocol, and modulates the signals in a manner to correct signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points driven from a single point at the bridge adapter unit.

Applicant argues that the transceiver/switch 400 of Goodman is located at a point where individual telephone lines from multiple local

networks converge for connection to a main trunk 476 (col. 11, lines 1-5). The transceiver/switch 400 is just that, a switch for switching received signals onto the telephone wiring and a transceiver for sending and receiving RF signals.

The Examiner states that it is undeniable that Goodman discloses functionality for driving signals within a LAN protocol and relies on the following portions of Goodman; Fig. 1A, item 405n, Col. 10, lines 65-67; Col. 11, lines 1-5, Col. 13, lines 5-42; Col. 15, lines 4-12; Col. 30, lines 37-63.

According to applicant's copy of the reference of Goodman, Fig 1A 405n are numerous extended pairs of telephone wiring extending from transceiver switch 400 and connecting to one of a plurality of Local Network Interfaces. Column 10, lines 65-67 recites the title of "Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiments". Column 11, lines 1-5 merely states that signals are communicated between the transceiver switch 400 and RF communication devices. Column 11, lines 45-55 states that local network interfaces 404a-404c can be located along said path, in the middle, or at the opposite end of the extended pairs 405. Further, this sited portion of Goodman states that communication line 402 provides high capacity communication (such as for cable TV signals) with remote locations. Goodman teaches that transceiver/switch 400 connects to line 402 to receive and transmit signals. It processes the signals it receives and switches them onto one of the extended pairs 405 leading to networks 411. Applicant points out to the Examiner that nowhere in the above disclosure of Goodman is any remote teaching of converting incoming signals to a LAN protocol by a Bridge Unit as claimed.

Further, column 13, lines 5-42 of Goodman discloses that control signals from the local networks 411 and are converted to RF for broadcast them out for reception by infrared responsive devices. Applicant points out

that lines 26-33 of col. 11 specifically states that transceiver/switch 400 assigns an ordinary NTSC television signal to more than one pair 405. Clearly, there is no conversion of incoming signals to LAN protocol before being switched to networks 411. Further, Goodman directly teaches away from the need to convert the signals by stating that the telephone devices 414 connect via a low-pass filter which prevent telephone devices from affecting RF energy on the local networks (col. 12, lines 46-50).

Column 15, lines 4-12 of Goodman, also referenced by the Examiner, describes signal flow between internal components of transceiver/switch 400 which does not read on signal transfer on a Local Area Network (LAN). Column 30 lines 37-63 of Goodman mentions a capability to convert signals by processor 418, but there is absolutely no suggestion or teaching that these signals are converted to a LAN protocol.

Applicant points out to the Examiner that LAN protocol is a specific protocol used in Local Area Networks such as Ethernet or Micro-PBX as disclosed and claimed in applicant's invention. This type of converting is not disclosed or suggested in the teachings of Goodman.

Applicant points out that the art of Goodman is specifically for transferring video signals to devices connected to telephone wiring, or via RF. Applicant's invention must convert to LAN protocol because many different devices are connected to the telephone wiring via a converter at each point of connection.

In embodiments of applicant's invention a LAN protocol, namely micro-PBX 301, is specifically used for driving the LAN, micro-PBX 301 being a converter and bus management system adapted to receive ATM data for all of the devices to which the micro-PBX is connected, and to route the data in a different protocol onto the internal bus. Micro-PBX operates the in-house wiring as a bus system under a multiple access points type protocol, such as Carrier Sense Multi Access/ Collision Detect

(CSMA/CD) protocol. This is a protocol type well known in the art that was also the basis of original Ethernet systems. In this system type, the sending device first listens on the bus for line free before sending data, then checks for collision. The inventor has selected this type bus management precisely because it allows use of the existing tree-type wiring structure of phone lines of most homes and businesses. In applicant's invention a bridge adapter unit translates signals incoming to the system from the public network to a LAN protocol, and then translates the signals back to the protocol specifically required by each end point device. The bridge unit of applicant's invention translates all of the incoming signals to the LAN protocol, including telephone signals.

Again, directing the Examiner's attention to figure 10 of Goodman, applicant points out that general signal processing section 471, having a plurality of filters and a local processor, changes the frequency of the incoming video signal to a frequency considerably different from the telephone signal which would normally transmit on the telephone lines in the network. The invention of Goodman drives the video signals onto the telephone lines at the different frequency in order to differentiate and separate out the video signals from telephone signals in order for the end point devices to process the video signals. A transceiver is therefore required for every instance where such signal differentiating takes place (figure 1a, transceivers 419a-c) which picks up the video signal from the telephone wires and converted back to a television signal, driving TV/VCR 498a, for example.

In applicant's invention the converters (305a-b) are converting signals from the Ethernet LAN protocol to a form required by the single media or multimedia device. For example, for a printer end device, the printer requires a serial printer protocol in order to process the signals, and the converters of applicant's invention, each converter specific to the end

device whether it be a printer, a computer or some other device, convert the signals from the LAN protocol to the protocol specifically required by the end device. Applicant's invention does not simply change the frequency at which the signals are transmitted, as is the case in the invention of Goodman.

Applicant argues that clearly, Goodman fails to disclose the type of communication management described and claimed in applicant's invention. Applicant cannot see where, in any of the referenced portions of Goodman, it is taught that incoming signals are converted to LAN protocol.

Regarding "point b" of the "Response to Arguments" portion of the Office Letter the Examiner states that Goodman teaches signal modulation. Applicant again points out that applicant's invention does not simply change the frequency at which the signals are transmitted, as is the case in the invention of Goodman, but converts all incoming signals to a LAN protocol before entering the local telephone wiring network.

Regarding "point c", applicant argues that the details of the convergence to LAN protocol as claimed in applicant's invention need not be recited in detail as LAN protocol is not even remotely taught in the art of Goodman.

Applicant argues that, as argued above on behalf of claim 1, there is no conversion of signals from voice-band to a LAN protocol in the art of Goodman. Goodman simply changes the frequency at which the signals are transmitted through telephone lines (that he refers to as local networks) in the network.

In view of the above facts and arguments presented by applicant above, applicant believes claims 1 and 2 is have been clearly shown to be patentable over the prior art of Goodman. Claims 3 and 4 are then

patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 7 is applicant's method claim analogous to apparatus claim 1, shown above to be patentable over the art cited and applied. The arguments presented above for patentability of claim 1 therefore apply as well to claim 7. Patentability of claim 7 over the art resides in steps (e), which recites modulating the signals in a manner to correct variations at the end points due to having multiple end points driven from the single point at the bridge adapter unit. The prior art of Goodman nowhere teaches this step. Claim 7 is therefore patentable over the art cited and applied, and claims 8, 9, 16 and 17 are patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim, or on their merits.

As all of the claims standing for examination as amended have been shown to be patentable over the art of Goodman, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Marked-Up Version to Show Changes

No changes to the claims or specification are herein made in the present response.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dan Kikinis

by _____

Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457